

Neighborhood Planning Advisory Committee

July 21, 2009

City Hall, Bertha Knight Landes Room
600 4th Ave, Seattle, WA 98124

MEETING SUMMARY

Prepared by Triangle Associates, Inc.

ATTENDANCE

✓ In attendance, □ Not in attendance, X Excused absence

Neighborhood Planning Advisory Committee Members			
Last	First	Affiliation/Neighborhood	In Attendance?
Ashkenazy	Boaz	At Large/Wedgewood	✓
Bailey	Adrienne	Central Area District Council/Central Area	✓
Brower	Josh	Seattle Planning Commission/Beacon Hill	✓
Coney	John	Magnolia-Queen Anne District Council/Queen Anne, Magnolia	✓
Coxley	Christie	Southeast District Council/Rainier Beach	✓
Edwards	Judith	Greater Duwamish District Council/North Beacon Hill	□
Hale	Jeannie	Northeast District Council/ Laurelhurst	✓
Harris	Ashley	Ballard District Council/Ballard	✓
Hill	Eddie	At Large/Southeast	X
Im	Thomas	At Large/Downtown	X
Knapton	Kay	Seattle Planning Commission	✓
Meeks	Sharonn	Southwest District Council/West Seattle	✓
Oien	Heidi	At Large/Capitol Hill	✓
Ramirez	Maria	Delridge District Council/Delridge	X
Saxman	Dennis	East District Council/Capitol Hill	✓
Stanford	Catherine	Downtown District Council	X
Staton	Renee	North District Council/Pinehurst	✓
Stineback	Kate	At Large	✓
Thaler	Toby	Lake Union District Council/Fremont	✓
Vergis Vinh	Diana	At Large	✓
Wall	Irene	City Neighborhood Council Neighborhood Planning Committee/Phinney Ridge	✓

Alternates			
Last	First	Alternate for	In Attendance?
Barker	Cindi	Irene Wall	✓
Benjamin	Craig	Dawn Hemminger	□
Counts	George	John Coney	□
Hinrix	Robert	Judith Edwards	□
Joncas	Kate	Catherine Stanford	□
Lee	Mona	Christie Coxley	□
Leighton	Amalia	Josh Brower and Kay Knapton	□
McAftertey	Blayne	Northwest District Council	□
Miller	David	Renee Staton	□
Melo	Sandra	Maria Ramirez	✓
Murakami	Pat	Adrienne Bailey	□
Ramey	Brian	Toby Thaler	✓
Wainwright	Mark	Sharonn Meeks	□

Project Team/Other City of Seattle			
Last	First	Organization	In Attendance?
Bicknell	Lyle	Department of Planning and Development	✓
Kern	Michael	Triangle Associates	✓
Nolte	Dan	Councilmember Clark's Office	✓
Stern	Renee	Triangle Associates	✓
Tenna	Sebhat	Department of Neighborhoods	✓
Trask	Blake	Triangle Associates	✓
Whittemore	Thomas	Department of Planning and Development	✓

Neighborhood Planning Advisory Committee
July 21, 2009
MEETING SUMMARY

Public			
Last	First	Affiliation	In Attendance?
Bradford	Bill	Central Area	✓

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Co-Chairs opened the meeting, welcomed the Neighborhood Plan Advisory Committee members, and led a round of introductions. The facilitator reviewed the agenda and meeting materials (available from the Committee's website). The Committee reviewed and approved the June 16, 2009 meeting summary (as revised at the meeting) by consensus.

Report on July 8 PLUNC Meeting

One of the Co-Chairs reported back to the Committee on the briefing he (along with representatives of the Department of Planning and Development, DPD, and Department of Neighborhoods, DON) had been asked to provide at the July 8 Seattle City Council Planning Land Use and Neighborhoods Committee (PLUNC) meeting. He said the briefing focused on outreach efforts and the contributions of planning outreach liaisons (POLs), who are serving as liaisons for underrepresented communities. Three of the POLs attended the briefing, to talk about how they are interfacing with their communities. The briefing also focused on the results of the first two sector open houses and the status of the neighborhood update process.

The Co-Chair said PLUNC members expressed a strong interest in the process and stated concern about poor attendance at the sector open houses. They asked for feedback on whether or not the process was more top-down or bottom-up. He responded that the sector open houses were being designed and conducted by NPAC and the Planning Commission, working together as volunteer citizen groups. He informed PLUNC that NPAC is concerned about funding for an adequate validation process for neighborhood plan updates. He urged PLUNC to recognize that neighborhood expectations are being raised through the sector open houses; it would be a shame to inadequately fund the next steps in the neighborhood update process.

A Committee member who attended the PLUNC briefing noted that he was pleased to see Council members interested in the attendance at the open houses. He stated that he is not satisfied with the attendance and that some of the citizens who have attended were not from the neighborhoods the open house was targeting. This member feels the City's presentation glossed over the differences being expressed over the approach to the update process. Another Committee member who attended the briefing added that PLUNC members seemed to realize that the outreach process was underfunded, and that NPAC members have had to take on much of the communications and outreach work for the sector open houses.

Neighborhood Plan Updates Subcommittee Report

The Neighborhood Plan Updates Subcommittee presented a report outlining its activities and recommendations to date (see the Committee's website). The Subcommittee Lead reviewed a letter the Committee had tasked the Subcommittee with drafting, which expresses concern about funding for the neighborhood planning process in the next biennium. Committee members discussed the funding letter, including whether specific funding targets or tasks to be funded should be included. One Committee member wanted the Committee to recommend that the City postpone major neighborhood planning until 2011, except in those neighborhoods facing the most change. Other Committee members voiced concern that the City is not providing funding to allow for adequate plan update validation.

Neighborhood Planning Advisory Committee
July 21, 2009
MEETING SUMMARY

The Co-Chairs checked to see if the Committee was in consensus about the Subcommittee's letter. The Committee was not in consensus, so the Co-Chairs invoked Robert's Rules of Order. It was moved and seconded to approve the Neighborhood Plan Updates Subcommittee's letter regarding funding for neighborhood planning. The motion carried with 16 members in favor, 1 opposed and no abstentions. The letter will be sent to the Mayor and City Council for review and consideration.

The Subcommittee Lead then reviewed the content of the Subcommittee's working draft report containing a general philosophy and recommendations by category for neighborhood plan updates (see Committee's website). He stated that this draft is aimed at stakeholders, assumes bottom-up activity and provides an initial list of important considerations for neighborhood plan updates. He emphasized that under the report's Land Use category, the Subcommittee is considering recommending that incentive zoning (which is currently used in Seattle to promote subsidized housing) be used more extensively to achieve neighborhood goals (though not in every neighborhood).

The Subcommittee Lead asked a Subcommittee member to review the ideas and concepts regarding sustainability included in the Environment category of the draft report. That member stated that US Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) standard provides a checklist for green building that is currently under wide use. The "LEED for Neighborhood Development" checklist (LEED ND) covers a wide range of sustainability issues for neighborhoods and includes metrics to measure smart growth, urbanism and green building. The Subcommittee recommends that NPAC promote use of the LEED ND checklist as a resource for neighborhood plan updates.

Several Committee members expressed concerns regarding the draft report, especially with the inclusion of incentive zoning in the recommendations. Several stated that they see incentive zoning as problematic and open to abuse by developers. One said the housing levy is the primary mechanism for promoting affordable housing, not incentive zoning. Another questioned whether LEED ND or any other checklist currently in use really does assure true sustainability. Members also expressed concern about language in the draft report regarding townhouses. One member suggested that the detailed concepts by category in the draft report may be more appropriate as an appendix to a more concise set of recommendations focused on what is unique in a neighborhood plan update, versus a neighborhood plan being created from scratch.

The Subcommittee Lead agreed that the Subcommittee should meet again, take these ideas into consideration and provide the Committee with a revised set of recommendations. DPD was asked if the Committee's advice would still be timely if it was not presented this month. DPD said that while sooner is better than later, a report submitted in August or September will still provide adequate time for the City to respond and incorporate the advice into its current set of neighborhood plan updates.

The Co-Chairs checked to see if the Committee was in consensus about the Subcommittee's report. The Committee was not in consensus, so the Co-Chairs invoked Robert's Rules of Order. It was moved and seconded to approve the Neighborhood Plan Updates Subcommittee's working draft report, with the understanding that the Subcommittee will provide the Committee with a revised report in August or September. The motion carried with 8 members in favor, 5 opposed and 4 abstentions. The facilitation team will provide the Subcommittee with the flip chart notes from the Committee's discussion of the report.

Feedback on Sector Open Houses Conducted to Date

Committee members provided feedback on the June 22 sector open house for Queen Anne, Belltown, Eastlake, Capitol Hill, First Hill and Pike/Pine as well as the July 8 open house for Lake City, Aurora/Licton Springs, Broadview – Bitter Lake – Haller Lake, and the University

Neighborhood Planning Advisory Committee
July 21, 2009
MEETING SUMMARY

Community. These meetings were the first two of five open houses being co-hosted by NPAC and the Seattle Planning Commission (as called for in City Council Resolution 31085 and Ordinance 122799) to provide an opportunity for citizens to learn about their neighborhood plan and work done so far to implement it, and to provide input about issues their neighborhood is facing and how well the neighborhood plan addresses these issues. Committee members who participated in these open houses came away with mixed impressions. Many members stated that attendance at the meetings was poor and they are concerned about the lack of outreach and its impact on future meetings. Other members stated that engagement by the public who did attend was excellent and that important neighborhood issues and desires were reported and discussed. Several members noted that while many open house participants were part of the original neighborhood planning process, many newcomers participated as well.

Committee members reported that myriad issues were discussed at the sector open houses including walkability, density, transit, social services, growth targets, open space, pedestrian access, and the impact of highways. A Committee member requested that sign-in sheets be made available for review throughout meeting. Another suggested that facilitators ensure that only community members are allowed to sit in the first ring around the table if it is crowded.

A member asked that facilitators stick to the small group discussion questions that were developed by NPAC and the Planning Commission, and not allow the flipcharts recording participants' views to be altered after participants leave. Another member indicated that he was fine with facilitators changing the questions and expressed the opinion that the format and content for the open houses is not consistent with the ordinance. It was noted that the Planning Commission has developed a "virtual" version of the open houses, with an online background presentation and questionnaire. Thus far, 50 people have completed that survey. A Committee member stated that there is a technology gap with outreach; people without Internet access are not receiving notification of the open houses.

PUBLIC COMMENT

A member of the Morgan Junction Community Association stated that she is very concerned about outreach for the sector open houses. She noted that after reviewing DON's community contact list, she found that only 88 people in West Seattle received email notification of the meeting. Key community leaders were not on the contact list and there was no posting of information at the neighborhood service centers. She added that there has been no outreach to community members who may need translation services. She urged the Committee to address the issue of outreach and promotion for the sector open houses.

A member of the public from the Central Area stated that he would like the report from the Neighborhood Planning Updates Subcommittee to include more specifics on the structure and content of proposed updates. He noted that the neighborhood plans are dramatically different from one another; there is currently no common format for the plans. He asked the Subcommittee to consider thinking of transit more holistically, in terms of how transit serves people who live, work and play in the neighborhood. Regarding the sector open houses, he stated that the Central Area should not be linked with South Seattle, given its ties to Capitol Hill and the International District. He stated that outreach for the open houses has been poor and the location of the sector open house in Rainer Beach will require a 30 minute drive for people from the Central Area. Plus it conflicts with a scheduled candidates forum. He would also like to see more explanation on what the neighborhood planning update process is and why community input is important. He urged the Committee to put pressure on the City to improve the process.

Neighborhood Planning Advisory Committee
July 21, 2009
MEETING SUMMARY

NEXT STEPS/FINAL THOUGHTS

The facilitator reviewed topics identified for the August agenda including possible updates from the Status Report, Sector Open House Subcommittee, Neighborhood Plan Update and Validation subcommittees. One Committee member emphasized the importance of the Committee considering Comprehensive Plan language and criteria for prioritizing the next rounds of neighborhoods to receive updates in a timely manner. She is concerned that the process will again become too rushed. The Co-Chairs agreed to review the Committee's timeline with this in mind.

The Co-Chairs thanked the members for their participation and adjourned the meeting. The Committee's next meeting will be Tuesday, August 18, 2009 at 6:15 pm in the Bertha Landes Room at City Hall.